DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 171 HE 004 330

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Anderson, S.; Salter, W. |
| TITLE | A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel, Volume II: Current Training Needs. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Program Planning and Evaluation (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | AAI-72-135 |
| PUB DATE | 25 Feb 73 |
| CONTRACT | OEC-0-71-3712 |
| NOTE | 58p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Administrative Personnel; *College Faculty; Educational Programs; *Higher Education; Manpower Utilization; Personnel Evaluation; *Personnel Needs; Research; Research Projects; Surveys; *Training Objectives |

ABSTRACT

Volume II of a study of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) training program for higher education personnel indicates the first of a three-faceted approach to assess current training needs. The approach, a survey, employed two questionnaires: the Presidential Questionnaire, designed to elicit background data and judgments concerning staffing needs; and the Training Preference Questionnaire, which gathered judgments concerning the perceived need of higher education professionals for various types of training. Following a discussion of the training questionnaire, survey results are organized according to training demand and personnel needs. The results of training demand are divided into three categories: training as a means of filling the needs of American colleges, relative importance of five categories of training, and relative demand for specific training activities. The five training categories are in human relations skills, managerial skills, information management skills, handling current special problems, and further academic studies. Characteristics of the sample of colleges are also presented. The appendix includes the questionnaire forms employed by the study. Related documents are HE 004 329, HE 004 331, and HE 004 332. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076171

# A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs For Higher Education Personnel

For: Office of Program Planning and Evaluation
U. S. Office of Education

By: Abt Associates Inc.
Cambridge, Massachusetts

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004 330

## Volume II: Current Training Needs

ED 076171

ABT ASSOCIATES INC.
55 WHEELER STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138
TELEPHONE • AREA 617-492-7100
TELEX 710-320-6367

Prepared For:

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
Office of Program Planning and Evaluation
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Contract No. OEC-0-71-3712

Principal Authors:

R. Anderson
W. Salter

# A Study of the Education Professions Development Act Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel

Volume II

Current Training Needs

- FINAL REPORT -

February 25, 1973

Report No. AAI-72-135

VOLUME II:

CURRENT TRAINING NEEDS

VOLUME II

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1.0 | METHODOLOGY OF THE TRAINING PREFERENCE SURVEY | 1 |
| 2.0 | FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY: TRAINING DEMAND | 7 |
| | 2.1 Training as a Means of Filling the Needs of American Colleges | 8 |
| | 2.2 Relative Importance of Five Categories of Training | 11 |
| | 2.3 Relative Demand for Specific Training Activities | 18 |
| 3.0 | FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY: PERSONNEL NEEDS | 25 |
| 4.0 | CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE OF COLLEGES | 35 |
| | APPENDIX | 41 |

VOLUME II

List of Tables


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1.1 | Distribution of responding institutions and respondents among college types and types of support | 4 |
| 1.2 | Distribution of Respondents Among College and Respondent Types | 5 |
| 2.1 | Total number of training activities checked as "necessary:" means per respondent by respondent category and college type | 9 |
| 2.2 | Total number of training experiences checked as "necessary:" means by respondent category and type of support | 10 |
| 2.3 | Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for all colleges | 12 |
| 2.4 | Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for two-year colleges | 13 |
| 2.5 | Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for four-year colleges | 14 |
| 2.6 | Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for public colleges | 15 |
| 2.7 | Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for private colleges | 16 |
| 2.8 | Frequency of "importance" judgments on categories of training as applied to recipient categories, expressed as percentages of total respondents | 17 |
| 2.9 | Frequency with which respondents in six categories "prescribe" training for themselves and for other classes of recipients | 19 |
| 2.10 | Frequencies of selection of training activities: means per respondent for two-year and four-year colleges, and for public and private colleges | 20-21 |
| 2.11 | Mean frequencies of selection of high-demand training activities, by respondent category | 23 |


/continued...

List of Tables - continued


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 3.1 | Reported personnel need distributions in two-year and in four-year colleges | 26 |
| 3.2 | Reported personnel need distributions in public and private colleges | 27 |
| 3.3 | Current personnel need priority distributions in two-year and four-year colleges, and in public and private colleges: weighted priority vote counts, with a response of "top need area" given 3 points, "second greatest" 2 points, and "third greatest" 1 point | 29 |
| 3.4 | Attributed sources of personnel needs in two-year and four-year colleges and in public and private colleges | 31 |
| 3.5 | Preferred methods of filling personnel needs in two-year and four-year colleges | 33 |
| 3.6 | Preferred methods of filling personnel needs in public and private colleges | 34 |
| 4.1 | For each of six college personnel groups, size distributions across sampled colleges reporting some group members | 36 |
| 4.2 | Mean size of six personnel categories in the college sample, for two-year and four-year colleges, and for public and private colleges | 37 |
| 4.3 | Current percentages of doctorates on the faculties of sampled colleges, and expected trends in faculty composition, for two-year and four-year colleges, and for public and private colleges | 38 |

## 1.0 Methodology of the Training Preference Survey

As part of its Study of the Education Professions Development Act, Part V-E, Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel, conducted under contract to the United States Office of Education, Abt Associates carried out a national survey of two-year and four-year colleges to assess personnel needs and the demand for various kinds of training in such colleges. Volume I of this report discusses the rationale of this survey and its logical relationships to the case studies and program profiling which also form part of the study.

### The Target Universe

The results of the survey are generalizable to the total population of professionals who fill the following six roles in two-year and four-year colleges in the United States:

Stratum 1: The President or other chief executive;

Stratum 2: The Academic Dean, Academic Vice President, Dean of the Faculty - the administrator responsible to the President for faculty affairs;

Stratum 3: The Dean of Students or Dean of Student Personnel Services;

Stratum 4: The Vice President for Administration or other chief business officer;

Stratum 5: The President of the Faculty Senate or other influential organization of faculty members, such as AAUP or AFT; and

Stratum 6: Staff Members in Charge of Minority-Oriented Programs -- e.g., the Director of Upward Bound, Higher Horizons, or Black Studies.

The universe of colleges for the survey comprises all two-year and four-year colleges in the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) list of institutions of higher education. Using the NCES definitions of "two-year college" and "four-year college," we have included in the sample some four-year colleges that call themselves universities and even some with a small number of graduate students, but the survey's primary emphasis is on IHEs that do not fit the customary research-oriented definition of a university.

## The Questionnaires

The survey employed two questionnaires: the Presidential Questionnaire, designed to elicit IHE background data and judgments concerning staffing needs and appropriate ways of satisfying those needs; and the Training Preference Questionnaire, which gathered judgments concerning the perceived need of higher education professionals for various types of training. Both Questionnaires appear as appendices to this volume.

## The Sample Design

We have drawn a stratified random sample of sixty institutions from the college universe defined above, including equal numbers of two-year and of four-year colleges. The president of each institution was asked to respond to the Presidential Questionnaire, and approximately six members of the college leadership, including the president, were asked to complete the Training Preference Questionnaire. These six respondents were chosen by virtue of occupying the roles which define the six strata discussed above.

The sample of college presidents is thus a simple random sample of all presidents of colleges in our target universe. Similarly, the sample of academic deans is a simple random sample of the universe of academic deans, and so on through the six strata. The total sample of

approximately 360 respondents is a doubly stratified random sample of the target universe of respondents.

Survey Procedures

The Office of Education sent a letter to the office of the president of each college in the sample, outlining the purposes and nature or the Study, enclosing the Presidential Questionnaire, and requesting his assistance in identifying the other appropriate respondents in his institution by means of a postcard supplied with the initial-contact letter. Through later telephone follow-up, names and titles of additional respondents were obtained. The Training Preference Questionnaire was then mailed to all respondents. After telephone follow-up of non-respondents, 43 usable Presidential Questionnaires and 209 usable Training Preference Questionnaires were coded and entered into the analysis; these comprise the sample on which the following summaries are based.

The initial sample design was intended to insure that our sample would cover the universe of interest essentially completely and that we would be able to estimate Training Preference response proportions within 15 percentage points, with 95% confidence, within each of the six universe strata. Table 1.1 displays the distribution of responding colleges across the two-year/four-year and public/private distinctions. Table 1.2 breaks down this distribution one step further, to the level of respondent types. The relatively low response rates among faculty leaders and minority program leaders (respondent categories 5 and 6) reflect largely the fact that many small colleges have nobody occupying these two roles. The actual sample yields estimates and comparisons with the following levels of precision:

- generalizations of response proportions to the total universe of Strata 1-6 (about 15,390 college professionals) with a 95% confidence interval of $\pm$ 7 percentage points or less

TABLE I.1

| College Type | Type of Support | | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Public | Private | |
| Two-Year | 19 colleges<br>78 respondents | 11 colleges<br>39 respondents | 30 colleges<br>117 respondents |
| Four-Year | 7 colleges<br>21 respondents | 23 colleges<br>71 respondents | 30 colleges<br>92 respondents |
| Totals | 26 colleges<br>99 respondents | 34 colleges<br>110 respondents | 60 colleges<br>209 respondents |

Table 1.1: Distribution of responding institutions and respondents among college types and types of support

TABLE 1.2

| Respondent Types | College Type | | Type of Support | | All Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Two-Year | Four-Year | Public | Private | |
| Presidential Questionnaire Respondents | 23 | 20 | 19 | 24 | 43 |
| Training Preference Questionnaire Respondents | | | | | |
| President | 23 | 16 | 17 | 22 | 39 |
| Academic Dean | 29 | 22 | 22 | 29 | 51 |
| Dean of Students | 25 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 45 |
| Vice President for Administration | 18 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 32 |
| Faculty Senate President | 14 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 25 |
| Minority Program Leader | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 17 |
| All Training Preference Questionnaire Respondents | 117 | 92 | 99 | 110 | 209 |

Table 1.2: Distribution of Respondents Among College and Respondent Types

- generalizations to two-year or four-year colleges within ± 10 points or less

- comparisons of two-year with four-year colleges within ± 15 points

These levels of precision permit us to detect reliably any broad and pervasive distinctions among our various classes of respondents with respect to the characteristics of interest, consistent with the level of distinctions involved in program funding strategies. A larger sample would permit more fine-grained analysis, but we doubt whether policy can usefully be made on the basis of such smaller, harder-to-discern distinctions as would inevitably flood a more sensitive analysis.

The confidence intervals cited above, as well as all other statistical statements in this volume, reflect the consequences of sample size but not those of nonresponse. Our statistics indicate the likelihood that the patterns we observe in sample data reflect similar patterns in the universes they represent and not merely sampling error. Given our sizable nonresponse, we must also address the question of the character of the universes actually represented. Section 4 of this volume presents basic summary statistics that reveal the distributions of size, ethnicity, and faculty/student mix in the sample of schools that responded. Table 1.1 reveals, similarly, the differential sample sizes among the various types of respondents. We caution the reader to let these descriptions guide his judgment as he decides how or whether to generalize our findings to situations of direct interest.

## 2.0 Findings of the Survey: Training Demand

What demand for professional training exists among the leadership of American higher education? This question, central to the purposes of this study, contains within its apparent simplicity a number of dimensions on which our survey results cast some light at various levels of detail:

- How do IHE officials feel about training in general?
- What relative demand exists, both in principle and in fact, for the various broad categories of training that have been tried or proposed for higher education professionals?
- Within the broad training categories, how does this demand vary among specific activities?

At each level of detail, moreover, we may ask how the perceived needs vary with the respondent's role in his institution and with the nature of the institution. Do college presidents typically perceive patterns of training need differently from faculty leaders or the leaders of minority-oriented programs on campus? How do the needs of two-year colleges or public colleges differ from those of four-year colleges or private colleges? To seek out answers to these questions, we consulted with key people in the Office of Education, scholars concerned with the future of higher education, and leaders in various IHE roles, asking them about the skills IHE professionals need and the types of training that might be useful for developing these skills. The lists of training categories, activities, and IHE roles around which the questionnaires are organized grew out of these consultations. As it happened, very few respondents took advantage of the open-endedness of the tables in the questionnaires to suggest further categories. The tables on the following pages summarize the responses to

our survey in ways that enable us to separate out some of the issues and draw appropriate conclusions.

## 2.1 Training as a Means of Filling the Needs of American Colleges

When presented with a list of training activities and asked to indicate which he feels are needed by himself and other professionals at his college, how many activities does the typical respondent check off? With no restrictions imposed on number of responses, we may reasonably regard the density of checks as a rough index of the extent to which the respondent regards training as an answer to his school's problems. Given the opportunity to prescribe any or all of 35 training activities for any or all of 11 types of his professional peers, we suppose that the respondent who checks many of the possible 385 combinations expresses a higher level of demand for training than does the respondent who checks fewer activities. This index reflects, of course, both the effects of enthusiasm for training in principle and felt need for training in fact. We have no way of sorting out these two effects in the analysis, but the distinction probably holds no vast degree of policy interest: both are meaningful aspects of demand. To the extent that interest in training results from urgent need, successful training can expect to work its way out of business, to nobody's dismay. Before need can spark positive responses to questions about training, moreover, we may reasonably suppose that the respondent must harbor some measure of confidence in training's intrinsic power.

Table 2.1 displays the distribution of this index of overall demand among respondent categories for two-year and four-year colleges, separately. This table suggests that training demand is fairly evenly distributed across leadership roles and equally divided between two-year and four-year colleges. Table 2.2 displays the distribution of demand for training across public and private colleges. Again, no really striking patterns emerge.

TABLE 2.1

| n = 209 | Two-Year Colleges | Four-Year Colleges | All Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|
| President | 132.3 | 143.5 | 136.9 |
| Academic Dean | 147.6 | 119.3 | 135.4 |
| Dean of Students | 139.4 | 153.9 | 145.9 |
| Vice-President for Administration | 119.7 | 120.5 | 120.1 |
| Faculty Senate President | 145.0 | 105.4 | 127.6 |
| Minority Program Leader | 125.6 | 134.9 | 130.5 |
| All Respondents | 136.7 | 131.1 | 134.2 |

Table 2.1: Total number of training activities checked as "necessary:" means per respondent by respondent category and college type.

TABLE 2.2

| n = 209 | Public Colleges | Private Colleges | All Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|
| President | 156.7 | 121.5 | 136.9 |
| Academic Dean | 137.0 | 134.1 | 135.4 |
| Dean of Students | 137.6 | 153.7 | 145.9 |
| Vice-President for Administration | 131.5 | 110.0 | 120.1 |
| Faculty Senate President | 133.1 | 119.3 | 127.6 |
| Minority Program Leader | 157.8 | 106.3 | 130.5 |
| All Respondents | 140.8 | 128.4 | 134.2 |

Table 2.2: Total number of training experiences checked as "necessary:" means by respondent category and type of support.

## 2.2 Relative Importance of Five Categories of Training

Given the roughly uniform level of training demand that we have discerned among our respondents, how does that demand distribute itself across the five broad categories into which existing and proposed training activities seem logically to fall? Our index of the relative importance of the training categories is derived from the responses to the final page of the Training Preference Questionnaire, where we ask the respondent to check the categories that he considers most important for each staff category. The index is simply the average number of "importance votes" per respondent for each training category; its possible range is thus from 0.0 to 11.0.

Table 2.3 displays the distribution of the importance index across the five training categories, for all colleges. Overall, the respondent IHE leaders rated human relations training as the most important kind of training for the professionals in their institutions and information management training as the least important, by more than a two-to-one margin in some respondent categories. Tables 2.4 and 2.5 present separate breakdowns for two-year and four-year colleges, respectively, and Tables 2.6 and 2.7 display similar breakdowns for public and private colleges.

Somewhat unexpectedly, a respondent's role and college type seem to have little effect on his views as to the relative importance of various types of training. The six kinds of respondents agree substantially among themselves in assigning varying levels of importance to the broad training categories. The distribution of responses is no less uniform across two-year and four-year colleges and across public and private colleges.

The IHE professionals who responded to our survey displayed some discernment in targeting the training categories to appropriate classes of recipients. Table 2.8 displays the relative frequencies with which our respondents "prescribed" training in each of the five categories for

| Training Categories \ Respondent Categories | President | Academic Dean | Dean of Students | Vice President for Administration | Faculty Leader | Minority Program Leader | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Training in Human Relations Skills | 6.69 | 6.39 | 6.96 | 5.47 | 6.24 | 7.88 | 6.53 |
| Training in Managerial Skills | 4.54 | 4.37 | 4.53 | 3.88 | 3.56 | 4.06 | 4.24 |
| Training in Information Management Skills | 4.31 | 3.80 | 4.51 | 3.06 | 2.52 | 3.53 | 3.76 |
| Training in Handling Current Special Problems | 4.74 | 4.43 | 5.11 | 3.91 | 3.84 | 5.06 | 4.54 |
| Further Academic Studies | 3.85 | 3.26 | 4.98 | 3.41 | 3.96 | 4.59 | 3.95 |
| All Training Categories | 4.83 | 4.45 | 5.22 | 3.94 | 4.05 | 5.02 | 4.60 |

Table 2.3: Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for all colleges.

| Training Categories \ Respondent Categories | President | Academic Dean | Dean of Students | Vice President for Administration | Faculty Leader | Minority Program Leader | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Training in Human Relations Skills | 6.35 | 6.86 | 7.04 | 5.67 | 7.21 | 6.50 | 6.63 |
| Training in Managerial Skills | 4.30 | 4.62 | 4.28 | 4.44 | 3.93 | 4.25 | 4.35 |
| Training in Information Management Skills | 4.22 | 4.24 | 4.76 | 3.44 | 2.29 | 4.50 | 4.01 |
| Training in Handling Current Special Problems | 4.78 | 4.86 | 4.52 | 4.44 | 4.21 | 5.00 | 4.64 |
| Further Academic Studies | 3.74 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 3.28 | 4.79 | 5.25 | 4.10 |
| All Training Categories | 4.68 | 4.92 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.49 | 5.10 | 4.75 |

Table 2.4: Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for two-year colleges.

| Training Categories \ Respondent Categories | President | Academic Dean | Dean of Students | Vice President for Administration | Faculty Leader | Minority Program Leader | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Training in Human Relations Skills | 7.19 | 5.77 | 6.85 | 5.21 | 5.00 | 9.11 | 6.40 |
| Training in Managerial Skills | 4.88 | 4.04 | 4.85 | 3.14 | 3.09 | 3.89 | 4.10 |
| Training in Information Management Skills | 4.44 | 3.23 | 4.20 | 2.57 | 2.82 | 2.67 | 3.45 |
| Training in Handling Current Special Problems | 4.69 | 3.86 | 5.85 | 3.21 | 3.36 | 5.11 | 4.40 |
| Further Academic Studies | 4.00 | 2.27 | 5.70 | 3.57 | 2.91 | 4.00 | 3.76 |
| All Training Categories | 5.04 | 3.84 | 5.50 | 3.54 | 3.44 | 4.96 | 4.42 |

Table 2.5: Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for four-year colleges.

| Training Categories \ Respondent Categories | President | Academic Dean | Dean of Students | Vice President for Administration | Faculty Leader | Minority Program Leader | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Training in Human Relations Skills | 7.06 | 6.77 | 6.36 | 4.93 | 6.60 | 8.25 | 6.54 |
| Training in Managerial Skills | 4.71 | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.67 | 3.73 | 5.50 | 4.34 |
| Training in Information Management Skills | 4.82 | 3.96 | 4.64 | 3.67 | 2.13 | 5.25 | 4.04 |
| Training in Handling Current Special Problems | 5.47 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.20 | 3.73 | 7.12 | 4.79 |
| Further Academic Studies | 4.00 | 2.91 | 4.68 | 3.33 | 4.33 | 5.88 | 4.01 |
| All Training Categories | 5.21 | 4.45 | 4.91 | 4.16 | 4.11 | 6.40 | 4.75 |

Table 2.6: Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for public colleges.

| Training Categories \ Respondent Categories | President | Academic Dean | Dean of Students | Vice President for Administration | Faculty Leader | Minority Program Leader | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Training in Human Relations Skills | 6.41 | 6.10 | 7.52 | 5.94 | 5.70 | 7.56 | 6.52 |
| Training in Managerial Skills | 4.41 | 4.69 | 4.83 | 3.18 | 3.30 | 2.78 | 4.14 |
| Training in Information Management Skills | 3.91 | 3.69 | 4.39 | 2.53 | 3.10 | 2.00 | 3.51 |
| Training in Handling Current Special Problems | 4.18 | 4.24 | 5.56 | 3.65 | 4.00 | 3.22 | 4.31 |
| Further Academic Studies | 3.73 | 3.52 | 5.26 | 3.47 | 3.40 | 3.44 | 3.90 |
| All Training Categories | 4.53 | 4.45 | 5.51 | 3.75 | 3.90 | 3.80 | 4.48 |

Table 2.7: Relative importance of training categories, by respondent category, for private colleges.

| Training Categories \ Recipient Categories (n = 209) | YOURSELF | PRESIDENT | DEANS | CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICERS | DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN | TENURED FACULTY | NON-TENURED FACULTY | STAFF OF MINORITY-ORIENTED PROGRAMS | STUDENT PERSONNEL AND ACADEMIC COUNSELORS | FINANCIAL AID OFFICERS | OTHER EDUCATIONAL SPECIALISTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Training in Human Relations Skills | 66% | 63% | 71% | 49% | 68% | 56% | 55% | 52% | 76% | 51% | 46% |
| Training in Managerial Skills | 64% | 65% | 64% | 61% | 50% | 9% | 7% | 17% | 30% | 34% | 24% |
| Training in Information Management Skills | 45% | 47% | 53% | 45% | 44% | 17% | 13% | 18% | 34% | 27% | 30% |
| Training in Handling Current Special Problems | 57% | 68% | 73% | 29% | 51% | 31% | 27% | 26% | 46% | 22% | 24% |
| Further Academic Studies | 39% | 24% | 37% | 16% | 49% | 60% | 59% | 28% | 33% | 19% | 28% |

Table 2.8: Frequency of "importance" judgments on categories of training as applied to recipient categories, expressed as percentages of total respondents.

each of the eleven kinds of potential trainees, expressed as percentages of respondents so prescribing. Training in managerial and information management skills was recommended for non-instructional personnel, except for staff of minority-oriented programs, and training in further academic studies skills for tenured and non-tenured faculty as well as department chairmen. Training in human relations skills was prescribed for all classes of personnel, as was training in handling current problems to a lesser extent. Presidents, deans, and department chairmen were the groups most frequently singled out for training. From this we infer that these IHE roles are assumed to involve a variety of responsibilities which are at least partially susceptible to training.

In this connection, it is interesting to note the extent to which the various kinds of respondents felt qualified or inclined to prescribe training for themselves or for their colleagues in other roles. Table 2.10 displays the average frequency with which respondents prescribed training for themselves and others. Deans, it turns out, prescribe training more freely for themselves and for other deans than for other groups; this is not true in the other categories. Only deans and department chairmen emerge in Table 2.9 as groups more in need of training than the respondents themselves.

## 2.3 Relative Demand for Specific Training Activities

The questionnaire specifies 35 distinct training activities, nested within the five broad categories. Some of these activities have played a part in Federal and other training programs, and others have been suggested as potential foci for future programs. As an indication of the relative overall demand for these activities, Table 2.10 displays the frequency with which our respondents "prescribed" each of the 35 activities for themselves or for their colleagues. By checking one or more columns in a given row of one of the five category tables of the Training Preference Questionnaire, a respondent contributed accordingly

| Respondent Categories \ Recipient Categories | YOURSELF | PRESIDENT | DEANS | CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER | DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN | TENURED FACULTY | NON-TENURED FACULTY | STAFF OF MINORITY-ORIENTED PROGRAMS | STUDENT PERSONNEL AND ACADEMIC COUNSELORS | FINANCIAL AID OFFICERS | OTHER EDUCATIONAL SPECIALISTS | ALL RECIPIENTS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| President | 12.7 | 12.0 | 17.4 | 11.2 | 15.5 | 12.9 | 10.9 | 9.6 | 15.2 | 9.0 | 10.5 | 12.4 |
| Academic Dean | 16.5 | 14.2 | 17.2 | 11.2 | 16.6 | 11.6 | 10.6 | 7.9 | 14.4 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 12.3 |
| Dean of Students | 18.4 | 14.7 | 19.4 | 12.4 | 15.3 | 12.4 | 10.0 | 10.1 | 16.3 | 9.1 | 7.8 | 13.3 |
| Vice President for Administration | 14.2 | 12.8 | 16.5 | 9.0 | 12.8 | 9.7 | 8.2 | 8.0 | 12.0 | 8.8 | 8.2 | 11.0 |
| Faculty Senate President | 11.6 | 15.0 | 17.6 | 9.7 | 16.1 | 12.8 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 11.7 | 6.6 | 7.2 | 11.6 |
| Minority Program Leader | 12.0 | 11.5 | 17.8 | 9.2 | 14.6 | 10.6 | 10.0 | 14.0 | 14.1 | 8.7 | 8.1 | 11.9 |
| All Respondents | 14.9 | 13.6 | 17.7 | 10.8 | 15.3 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 9.3 | 14.2 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 12.2 |

Table 2.9: Frequency with which respondents in six categories "prescribe" training for themselves and for other classes of recipients.

TABLE 2.10

| Training Activities | Types of Colleges | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2-Year | 4-Year | Public | Private | All |
| 1. Group dynamics techniques | 5.45 | 4.83 | 5.18 | 5.17 | 5.18 |
| 2. How to conduct group dynamics training | 2.38 | 1.80 | 2.44 | 1.84 | 2.13 |
| 3. Interviewing, one-to-one work | 5.42 | 5.95 | 5.18 | 6.07 | 5.65 |
| 4. Relating to people of other races, cultures | 5.86 | 5.91 | 6.27 | 5.53 | 5.88 |
| 5. Leadership training | 4.84 | 4.48 | 4.89 | 4.49 | 4.68 |
| 6. How to conduct leadership training | 2.25 | 2.14 | 2.22 | 2.18 | 2.20 |
| 7. Developing goals and operating programs | 5.74 | 5.40 | 5.67 | 5.53 | 5.59 |
| 8. Allocating funds to competing needs | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.25 | 4.21 | 4.23 |
| 9. Planning physical facilities | 3.08 | 2.74 | 3.25 | 2.64 | 2.93 |
| 10. Accounting and budgeting | 3.07 | 3.17 | 3.11 | 3.12 | 3.12 |
| 11. Developing and managing a project | 4.05 | 3.90 | 4.04 | 3.94 | 4.00 |
| 12. Scheduling and budgeting a project | 3.89 | 3.30 | 3.88 | 3.41 | 3.63 |
| 13. Conducting meetings that get things done | 5.09 | 4.72 | 4.82 | 5.03 | 4.93 |
| 14. Fund-raising from private sources | 1.86 | 2.06 | 1.88 | 2.02 | 1.95 |
| 15. Fund-raising from large institutions | 2.98 | 2.95 | 3.25 | 2.71 | 2.97 |
| 16. Improving reading skills | 2.87 | 2.40 | 2.91 | 2.44 | 2.67 |
| 17. Digesting, summarizing and reporting | 4.33 | 3.90 | 4.40 | 3.91 | 4.14 |
| 18. Using and utilizing computers | 3.91 | 3.70 | 4.68 | 3.04 | 3.81 |
| 19. Effective use of information resources | 4.38 | 4.35 | 4.58 | 4.18 | 4.37 |
| 20. Improving oral and written communications | 4.35 | 3.83 | 4.35 | 3.91 | 4.12 |
| 21. Designing and implementing a research project | 3.60 | 3.85 | 3.92 | 3.52 | 3.71 |

/continued...

Table 2.10 -- continued

| Training Activities | Types of Colleges | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2-Year | 4-Year | Public | Private | All |
| 22. Structuring and managing information flows | 4.10 | 4.06 | 4.17 | 4.01 | 4.09 |
| 23. Participating in collective bargaining | 2.92 | 2.70 | 3.27 | 2.42 | 2.82 |
| 24. Dealing with problems of drug abuse | 3.86 | 3.39 | 3.88 | 3.46 | 3.66 |
| 25. Implications of laws and judicial precedents | 4.44 | 4.26 | 4.60 | 4.14 | 4.36 |
| 26. Conducting minority-oriented programs | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 3.67 | 4.02 |
| 27. Conducting programs for the disadvantaged | 4.50 | 4.09 | 4.86 | 3.83 | 4.32 |
| 28 Working with changing roles of students | 3.87 | 4.50 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.15 |
| 29. Helping students plan careers | 4.09 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 4.02 | 4.11 |
| 30. Psychology, sociology, history, philosophy of education | 3.76 | 3.61 | 3.71 | 3.68 | 3.69 |
| 31. Education law | 3.34 | 2.70 | 3.75 | 2.44 | 3.06 |
| 32. Individual academic studies | 3.94 | 3.89 | 3.87 | 3.96 | 3.92 |
| 33. Learning theory | 3.40 | 3.64 | 3.58 | 3.44 | 3.51 |
| 34. Curriculum design | 3.69 | 3.82 | 3.85 | 3.66 | 3.75 |
| 35. Test design | 3.12 | 2.67 | 3.15 | 2.72 | 2.92 |
| All Activities | 3.90 | 3.75 | 4.02 | 3.67 | 3.84 |

Table 2.10: Frequencies of selection of training activities: means per respondent for two-year and four-year colleges, and for public and private colleges.

to the corresponding row of Table 2.10. The demand index is presented as a mean per respondent and thus varies from 0.0 to 11.0. Of the 35 activities, 6 account for a substantial fraction of the total demand. The rank order among these is essentially the same between two-year and four-year colleges and between public and private colleges. The major variations are that two-year colleges stress developing goals and operating programs, and public colleges place a higher priority on relating to people of other races and cultures.

Table 2.11 displays the distribution of selection frequencies for these high-demand activities among the six respondent categories. At this finer level of detail, essentially the same variation among kinds of training emerges as in Table 2.11. And again, as in Tables 2.3 through 2.7, the variation among respondent categories is relatively low: respondents in various roles seem to see eye to eye, by and large, in selecting specific training activities and in assigning them to their colleagues.

| Training Activities in High Demand | President | Academic Dean | Dean of Students | Vice President for Administration | Faculty Senate President | Minority Program Leader | All Respondents |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Respondent Categories | | | | | | |
| 1. Group Dynamics Techniques | 4.82 | 5.98 | 5.71 | 4.44 | 4.48 | 4.60 | 5.18 |
| 3. Interviewing, one-to-one work | 5.77 | 5.80 | 5.87 | 4.78 | 5.68 | 5.94 | 5.65 |
| 4. Relating to people of other races, cultures | 6.05 | 6.22 | 6.04 | 5.50 | 4.60 | 6.65 | 5.88 |
| 5. Leadership training | 4.67 | 4.69 | 5.67 | 4.47 | 3.88 | 3.65 | 4.68 |
| 7. Developing goals and operating programs | 5.80 | 6.57 | 5.71 | 4.69 | 5.24 | 4.12 | 5.59 |
| 13. Conducting meetings that get things done | 5.05 | 4.98 | 5.00 | 4.88 | 4.92 | 4.41 | 4.93 |

Table 2.11: Mean frequencies of selection of high-demand training activities, by respondent category.

## 3.0 Findings of the Survey: Personnel Needs

What are higher education's personnel needs? What services are currently going undelivered or inadequately delivered because people with the necessary skills are not in the right place at the right time? Why do these needs exist and persist? What services are overstaffed, so that some of their providers might be good candidates for retraining and reassignment? Among possible ways of filling personnel needs, how high does training rate in the eyes of those who must see to it that services are delivered? The presidents of 24 colleges, in responding to our Presidential Questionnaire, have provided some evidence that bears upon these questions of personnel need.

Table 3.1 displays the distribution of reported need for qualified personnel to deliver thirteen services, for two-year and four-year colleges. First, we note a very low level of overstaffing. In no service category did more than one college president report needing fewer people than now employed. Job and personal counseling (though not academic counseling) emerge with remedial instruction, placement services, and admissions and recruiting as high need areas. In the less student-oriented domain, presidents also feel a need for more people to carry out institutional research and evaluation, long-range planning, and institutional development and fund-raising.

Comparing two-year and four-year colleges, we find that while presidents of both types of institutions tend to have similar perceptions about personnel needs, the reported need for skilled personnel tends to be somewhat greater in four-year institutions, especially in the service categories of personal counseling and long-range planning. For placement services, on the other hand, presidents of two-year colleges reported a greater need.

Similar trends emerge from a parallel distribution of public and private colleges in Table 3.2. The only really substantial difference between the needs expressed by public and private colleges appears in the

| Service Categories | Current Need for Personnel to Deliver Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Two-Year Colleges | | | | Four-Year Colleges | | | | All Colleges | | | |
| | Fewer | No More | Some More | Many More | Fewer | No More | Some More | Many More | Fewer | No More | Some More | Many More |
| Academic Counseling | 0 | 17 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 8 | 1 |
| Job Counseling | 0 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 17 | 1 |
| Personal Counseling | 0 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 18 | 3 |
| Remedial Instruction | 0 | 10 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 18 | 4 |
| Admissions and Recruiting | 0 | 14 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 1 |
| Financial Aid Services | 0 | 16 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 13 | 0 |
| Placement Services | 0 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 16 | 2 |
| Institutional Financial Management | 0 | 16 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 9 | 0 |
| Institutional Research and Evaluation | 1 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 24 | 1 |
| Institutional Development and Fund-Raising | 0 | 10 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 24 | 1 |
| Long-Range Planning | 0 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 17 | 1 |
| Physical Plant Management and Planning | 0 | 13 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 14 | 1 |
| Library Services | 0 | 15 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 25 | 13 | 2 |
| Totals | 1 | 169 | 92 | 11 | 6 | 128 | 117 | 7 | 7 | 297 | 209 | 18 |

Table 3.1: Reported personnel need distributions in two-year and in four-year colleges.

| Service Categories | Current Need for Personnel to Deliver Services | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Public Colleges | | | | Private Colleges | | | | All Colleges | | | |
| | Fewer | No More | Some More | Many More | Fewer | No More | Some More | Many More | Fewer | No More | Some More | Many More |
| Academic Counseling | 0 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 8 | 1 |
| Job Counseling | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 17 | 1 |
| Personal Counseling | 0 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 18 | 3 |
| Remedial Instruction | 0 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 18 | 4 |
| Admissions and Recruiting | 0 | 10 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 18 | 1 |
| Financial Aid Services | 0 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 13 | 0 |
| Placement Services | 0 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 22 | 16 | 2 |
| Institutional Financial Management | 0 | 14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 9 | 0 |
| Institutional Research and Evaluation | 1 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 24 | 1 |
| Institutional Development and Fund-raising | 0 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 24 | 1 |
| Long-range Planning | 0 | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 23 | 17 | 1 |
| Physical Plant Management and Planning | 0 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 14 | 1 |
| Library Services | 0 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 25 | 13 | 2 |
| Totals | 1 | 134 | 88 | 11 | 6 | 163 | 121 | 7 | 7 | 297 | 209 | 18 |

Table 3.2: Reported personnel need distributions in public and private colleges

category of long-range planning, where private colleges report greater need than do their public counterparts, probably reflecting the tendency of public institutions to rely largely upon legislatures, boards of regents, and other superordinate bodies for the long view.

Table 3.3 gives us another perspective on the relative need priorities in two-year and four-year and in public and private colleges. When asked to indicate specifically their first, second, and third priorities among the thirteen service categories listed, the college presidents distributed their votes as shown. Essentially the same pattern characterizes this forced-choice response situation as that which we saw in the free-response context. When presidents have a limited number of choices--analogous, perhaps, to limited training resources--they rank admissions and recruiting first, followed by institutional development and fund raising, personal counseling, and institutional research and evaluation. Remedial instruction, as one might expect, is an issue primarily in two-year and public colleges, who must satisfy the needs of the "new student." Institutional development and fund-raising and long-range planning have high priority in private colleges, both two-year and four-year, but not in public colleges.

To sum up, the main elements in the personnel demand picture seem to be these. College presidents do perceive a need for more trained personnel in most of thirteen service categories, especially counseling for students and institutional planning, research, and development. In general, established service areas such as academic counseling are given lower priority than those services needed to respond to new types of students and student needs and new opportunities for and constraints on institutional development. The overall need for skilled personnel was judged more urgent by presidents of four-year and/or private colleges than by presidents of two-year and/or public colleges.

How do personnel needs arise? To what circumstances or conditions do college presidents attribute the staff shortages that hamper them?

TABLE 3.3

| Service Categories | Current Personnel Need Priority Areas | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Two-Year Colleges | Four-Year Colleges | Public Colleges | Private Colleges | All Colleges |
| Academic Counseling | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| Job Counseling | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Personal Counseling | 10 | 9 | 5 | 13 | 19 |
| Remedial Instruction | 11 | 3 | 12 | 2 | 14 |
| Admissions and Recruiting | 17 | 14 | 13 | 18 | 31 |
| Financial Aid Services | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Placement Services | 6 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 |
| Institutional Financial Management | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Institutional Research and Evaluation | 7 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 17 |
| Institutional Development and Fund-Raising | 13 | 13 | 3 | 23 | 26 |
| Long-Range Planning | 5 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 13 |
| Physical Plant Management and Planning | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Library Services | 6 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 9 |

Table 3.3: Current personnel need priority distributions in two-year and four-year colleges, and in public and private colleges: weighted priority vote counts, with a response of "top need area" given 3 points, "second greatest" 2 points, and "third greatest" 1 point.

Among the many possible contributing factors, our questionnaire specified three and offered the respondents the opportunity to check one of them or to specify others. The three listed factors were:

- People with required skill not available (abbreviated to "people" in the table headings);
- Can't afford hiring or retraining (appreviated to "money");
- Institutional resistance; lack of institutional readiness (abbreviated to "unready").

Clearly enough, these three explanatory factors, where invoked, call for different actions on the part of any outside agency that may wish to offer support to fulfill the needs. The distribution of these attributions over the thirteen service categories, for two-year and four-year colleges and for public and private colleges, appears in Table 3.4.

The results clearly indicate that college presidents believe money to be the major source of very nearly all of their training problems. The pattern holds constant across two-year and four-year colleges, and public and private colleges. While the distribution of responses in no way paints a more encouraging picture of the college financial crisis, it does suggest that neither institutional readiness nor the availability of qualified personnel are perceived by college presidents as primary barriers to meeting personnel requirements.

Given that personnel needs exist, in what ways would college presidents prefer to fill them? Training is, after all, only one of a number of possible ways. The Training Preference Questionnaire addressed the question of the competitive position of training in the preferences of the IHE leaders in a rather oblique way (cf. Section 2.1, above); the Presidential Questionnaire approaches the question more directly. Here,

| | Primary Obstacles to Filling Personnel Needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Two-Year Colleges | | | Four-Year Colleges | | | Public Colleges | | | Private Colleges | | | All Colleges | | |
| Service Categories | People | Money | Unready | People | Money | Unready | People | Money | Unready | People | Money | Unready | People | Money | Unready |
| Academic Counseling | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 |
| Job Counseling | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 1 |
| Personal Counseling | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 0 |
| Remedial Instruction | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 1 |
| Admissions and Recruiting | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 17 | 1 |
| Financial Aid Services | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| Placement Services | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 |
| Inst. Financial Management | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| Inst. Research & Evaluation | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 3 |
| Inst. Development & Fund-Raising | 0 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 2 |
| Long-Range Planning | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 2 |
| Phys. Plant Management & Planning | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 1 |
| Library Services | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 2 |
| TOTALS | 2 | 92 | 6 | 3 | 96 | 8 | 2 | 96 | 6 | 3 | 92 | 8 | 5 | 188 | 14 |

Table 3.4: Attributed sources of personnel needs in two-year and four-year colleges and in public and private colleges.

we offered the respondent five categories of possible methods for filling existing personnel needs:

- Reassign duties of existing staff now delivering the service so they can devote more time to it (abbreviated to "reassign" in the table headings);

- Retrain current staff in-service, on campus (abbreviated to "in-service");

- Retrain current staff off-campus (abbreviated to "Off-campus");

- Hire additional staff to deliver the service (abbreviated to "hire");

- Not sure how best to fill the need for the service, or will fill in some other way (abbreviated to "other").

Tables 3.5 and 3.6 display the distribution of these preferred methods across the thirteen service categories, in two-year and four-year colleges, and in public and private colleges, respectively. The results suggest that in the judgment of college presidents, the training of current staff is not in a very strong competitive position relative to other means of filling personnel needs. In all service categories, college presidents clearly prefer to meet their personnel requirements by hiring new staff. This is hardly surprising, of course: we would expect substantial interest in retraining only if some staff categories were significantly overstaffed. In a general climate of manpower shortage, presidents would of course prefer to increase their payrolls rather than shift people around from role to role, if finances permitted. Lacking needed funds for hiring, they express some demand for in-service training to increase the current staff's ability to carry the burden.

| Service Categories | Preferred Methods of Filling Personnel Needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Two-Year Colleges | | | | | Four-Year Colleges | | | | | All Colleges | | | | |
| | Re-assign | In-Service | Off-Campus | Hire | Other | Re-assign | In-Service | Off-Campus | Hire | Other | Re-assign | In-Service | Off-Campus | Hire | Other |
| Academic Counseling | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Job Counseling | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Personal Counseling | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 1 |
| Remedial Instruction | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 |
| Admissions and Recruiting | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Financial Aid Services | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Placement Services | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Inst. Financial Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Inst. Research and Evaluation | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 2 |
| Inst. Development and Fund-Raising | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 1 |
| Long-Range Planning | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Phys. Plant Management & Planning | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| Library Services | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| TOTALS | 7 | 16 | 8 | 45 | 7 | 12 | 13 | 3 | 62 | 8 | 19 | 29 | 11 | 107 | 15 |

Table 3.5: Preferred methods of filling personnel needs in two-year and four-year colleges.

| | Preferred Methods of Filling Personnel Needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Public Colleges | | | | | Private Colleges | | | | | All Colleges | | | | |
| Service Categories | Re-Assign | In-Service | Off-Campus | Hire | Other | Re-assign | In-Service | Off-Campus | Hire | Other | Re-assign | In-Service | Off-Campus | Hire | Other |
| Academic Counseling | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| Job Counseling | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Personal Counseling | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 1 |
| Remedial Instruction | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 2 |
| Admissions and Recruiting | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 0 |
| Financial Aid Services | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Placement Services | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Inst. Financial Management | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Inst. Research and Evaluation | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 2 |
| Inst. Development and Fund-Raising | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 1 |
| Long-Range Planning | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Phys. Plant Management & Planning | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| Library Services | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| TOTALS | 7 | 9 | 6 | 58 | 7 | 12 | 20 | 5 | 49 | 8 | 19 | 29 | 11 | 107 | 15 |

Table 3.6: Preferred methods of filling personnel needs in public and private colleges.

## 4.0 Characteristics of the Sample of Colleges

At this point the reader may well ask himself how well these summary statistics fit some specific higher education context of interest to him. As we noted earlier in Section 1.0, our college sample is a rather straightforward probabilistic sample of all two-year and four-year colleges in the United States. Its generalizability to that larger population is therefore assured, within the limits imposed by the statistical implications of sample size and nonresponse bias, as discussed in Section 1.0. It may help the reader to interpret the tabulated results in some specific context of interest, however, if he has a more concrete idea of the principal characteristics of the 23 colleges who leaders responded to the survey. The tables in this section summarize for these institutions the basic characteristics of their administrations, faculties, staffs, and student bodies that bear a logical relationship to our concerns for staffing and training needs.

How large are the student bodies and various staff categories of the sampled IHEs and how is IHE size distributed through the sample? Table 4.1 displays the various statistics that describe the size distribution. The sample consists of 23 colleges enrolling 21,273 students. The size distribution is skewed positively: although our sample and universe consist primarily of small colleges, the larger schools within the small-college category predominate in number.

Taking the mean as possibly the best single summary index of the size of each personnel category, we display in Table 4.2 the distribution of these size statistics across two-year and four-year colleges and across public and private colleges.

A final relevant characteristic is the percentage of faculty members holding doctoral degrees, coupled with the expectation of the college leadership that the percentage will grow, remain the same, or decrease in the future. Table 4.3 summarizes the responses of our college presidents to the Presidential Questionnaire's direct question on this

TABLE 4.1

| Personnel Category | Total | Mean | Standard Deviation | Median | Maximum | Minimum | Range | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FTE Students | 51,665 | 1230 | 1430 | 700 | 6448 | 85 | 6363 | 42 |
| Administrators | 645 | 15.3 | 20.1 | 8.4 | 124 | 1 | 123 | 43 |
| Tenured Faculty | 2,047 | 62.0 | 122 | 32.8 | 705 | 4 | 701 | 33 |
| Non-Tenured Faculty | 2,013 | 47.9 | 65.5 | 26.5 | 382 | 1 | 381 | 42 |
| Counselors | 260 | 7.0 | 19.0 | 3.0 | 118 | 1 | 117 | 37 |
| Other Educational Specialists | 237 | 5.5 | 6.6 | 3.8 | 34 | 1 | 33 | 43 |

Table 4.1: For each of six college personnel groups, size distributions across sampled colleges reporting some group members.

TABLE 4.2

| Personnel Category | Two-Year Colleges | Four-Year Colleges | Public Colleges | Private Colleges | All Colleges |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FTE Students | 1520 | 879 | 2165 | 529 | 1230 |
| Administrators | 17.7 | 12.6 | 21.7 | 10.3 | 15.3 |
| Tenured Faculty | 107.4 | 32.6 | 108.7 | 23.2 | 62.0 |
| Non-Tenured Faculty | 56.2 | 38.8 | 76.8 | 24.0 | 47.9 |
| Counselors | 10.1 | 2.9 | 11.4 | 2.9 | 7.0 |
| Other Educational Specialists | 5.9 | 5.0 | 8.2 | 3.4 | 5.5 |

Table 4.2: Mean size of six personnel categories in the college sample, for two-year and four-year colleges, and for public and private colleges.

TABLE 4.3

| College Categories | Current % of Faculty Doctorates | Expected Trend | | | Number of Colleges Responding |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Decrease | Remain Constant | Increase | |
| Two-Year Colleges | 8.0% | 4% | 32% | 64% | 22 |
| Four-Year Colleges | 43.8% | 0% | 30% | 70% | 20 |
| Public Colleges | 17.1% | 6% | 39% | 55% | 18 |
| Private Colleges | 30.5% | 0% | 25% | 75% | 24 |
| All Colleges | 24.6% | 2% | 31% | 67% | 42 |

Table 4.3: Current percentages of doctorates on the faculties of sampled colleges, and expected trends in faculty composition, for two-year and four-year colleges, and for public and private colleges.

point. In each college category, roughly two-thirds of the presidents expect an increase in the doctoral proportion, one-third expect the proportion to stay the same, and practically none expect it to decrease. EPDA V-E planners should consider what this statistic may mean for their support of fellowship programs leading to the doctorate. To some degree, presidents may simply be responding to an awareness that a buyer's market for doctorates already exists in some fields and may be growing. Two-year institutions, on the other hand, may actively seek to recruit people with doctorates, either as part of a general thrust toward university characteristics and status, or merely to upgrade their faculties in general.

# APPENDIX

October 18, 1972
OMB No. 51-S72050
Approval expires December 31, 1972

1-(1)

ID# [ | | | | ] 2-5

# PRESIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

[ 6-(1) ]

7-10 blank

NAME OF INSTITUTION _____

Number of full-time equivalent*(FTE) students, excluding continuing education and extension students [ | | | | | ] 11-15

Number of continuing education and extension students [ | | | | | ] 16-20

(For all of the following questions, please do not count continuing education and extension students in your answers.)

NOW, PLEASE INDICATE THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGES OF FTE STUDENTS IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING SOCIO-ECONOMIC CATEGORIES. (We realize, of course, that these can only be estimates.)

Percentages of FTE students:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Male | % | 21-23 |
| Female | % | 24-26 |
| Total | 100% | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| White | % | 27-29 |
| Black | % | 30-32 |
| Chicano/Spanish Surnamed | % | 33-34 |
| Other racial backgrounds (Oriental, American Indian, etc.) | % | 35-36 |
| Total | 100% | |

Please indicate how many full-time equivalent staff members you have at your institution in each of the following categories.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Administrators | [ | ] 37-39 |
| Tenured Faculty | [ | ] 40-42 |
| Non-Tenured Faculty | [ | ] 43-45 |
| Counselors | [ | ] 46-48 |
| Other Educational Specialists (e.g., librarians, audio-visual staff, CAI staff) | [ | ] 49-51 |

END CRD 1

* If you don't currently compute this, an easy and frequently used formula is: The number of full-time equivalent students is equal to the number of full-time students plus one-third of the number of part-time students.

START CRD 2
DUP 1-5
6-(2) 7-10 blank

NOW, IN EACH BOX IN THE TABLES BELOW, PLEASE ENTER THE APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE OF STAFF MEMBERS IN EACH CATEGORY (column) WITH THE INDICATED CHARACTERISTICS. (Again, we realize you must estimate.)

| STAFF characteristics / STAFF Categories | Administrators | Tenured Faculty | Non-Tenured Faculty | Counselors & Financial Aid Officers | Other Educational Specialists |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | % 11-13 | % 17-19 | % 23-25 | % 29-31 | % 35-37 |
| Female | % 14-16 | % 20-22 | % 26-28 | % 32-34 | % 38-40 |
| TOTALS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

END CRD 2
START CRD 3
DUP 1-5 6-(3) 7-10 blank

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| White | % 11-13 | % 23-25 | % 35-37 | % 47-49 | % 59-61 |
| Black | 14-% 16 | 26-% 28 | 38-% 40 | % 50-52 | % 62-64 |
| Chicano and/or other Spanish surnamed | % 17-19 | % 29-31 | % 41-43 | % 53-55 | % 65-67 |
| Other Ethnic | % 20-22 | % 32-34 | % 44-46 | % 56-58 | % 68-70 |
| TOTALS | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

END CRD 3

START CRD 4
DUP 1-5
6-(4)
7-10 blank

What is the current per cent of doctorates on the faculty? [ ][ ]% 11-12

Do you expect it to go down, stay the same, or go up by 1979-80?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| decrease | [ ] | 13-1 |
| stay the same | [ ] | -2 |
| increase | [ ] | -3 |

Please help us to understand the relative need at your institution for people to deliver various services. In the table that follows please indicate for each service (row) how many additional people you need to deliver the service now.

Circle "L" ("Less") if you already have more people than you need to deliver that service to your present student body and therefore need less supply; OR

Circle "N" ("None") if your current supply of professional manpower just meets your needs; OR

Circle "S" ("Some") if you need some more people in that category; OR

Circle "M" ("Many") if you need many more people.

Then, please indicate the three greatest need areas in the entire list by writing "1" in the row of the top need area; "2" in the second greatest need area and "3" in the third.

And, for each understaffed service (for which you indicated either "some" or "Much" unfilled need), please check the column that indicates the primary reason the need is unfilled.

Finally, for each understaffed area, please check the column which indicates most accurately how you expect to fill the need.

Current Need for Personnel to Deliver Services

| SERVICES | Present Need for People to Deliver the Services: L=Less people needed N=No more people needed S=Some more people needed M=Many more people needed | Top Three Need Areas: 1=top need area of all services listed 2=2nd greatest need area 3=3rd greatest need area | Reason that the Need Exists. (Please check the one most important reason that your institution has not filled the need for personnel to deliver this service.) *Other reasons explain. | | | Preferred Method for Filling | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | People with required skill not available | Can't afford hiring or retraining | Institutional Resistance: Lack of institutional readiness | Reassign duties of Existing staff now delivering the service so they can devote more time to it | Retrain current staff: Retrain by: In-Service/On Campus | Retrain current staff: Retrain by: Off campus/ (formal) | Hire additional staff to deliver the service | Not sure how best to fill the need for the service/or will fill some other way **Other ways explain. |
| Remedial & Counseling | L N S M 14- | 30- | [ ]46-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]11-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Counseling: | L N S M 15- | 31- | [ ]47-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]12-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Academic Counseling | L N S M 16- | 32- | [ ]48-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]13-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Job Counseling | L N S M 17- | 33- | [ ]49-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]14-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Personal Counseling | L N S M 18- | 34- | [ ]50-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]15-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Remedial Instruction | L N S M 19- | 35- | [ ]51-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]16-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Supportive & Administrative Services | L N S M 20- | 36- | [ ]52-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]17-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Admissions & Recruiting | L N S M 21- | 37- | [ ]53-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]18-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Financial Aid Services | L N S M 22- | 38- | [ ]54-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]19-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Placement Services | L N S M 23- | 39- | [ ]55-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]20-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Institutional Financial Management | L N S M 24- | 40- | [ ]56-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]21-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Institutional Research & Evaluation | L N S M 25- | 41- | [ ]57-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]22-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Institutional Development & Fundraising | L N S M 26- | 42- | [ ]58-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]23-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Long-range planning, except physical Facilities planning | L N S M 27- | 43- | [ ]59-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]24-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Physical plant Management and Physical Facilities Planning | L N S M 28- | 44- | [ ]60-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]25-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |
| Library Services | L N S M 29- | 45- | [ ]61-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]26-1 | [ ]-2 | [ ]-3 | [ ]-4 | [ ]-5 |

*Other reasons (please explain) _____ 62-

_____ 63-

_____ 64-

**Other ways to fill needs (please explain) _____ 27-

_____ 28-

_____ 29-

END CRD 4

START CRD 5
DUP 1-5
6-(5) 7-10 blank

Please return this Questionnaire in the attached envelope addressed to our research contractor, Abt Associates Inc., 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Thank you again for your time and cooperation.

PLEASE USE THIS SPACE FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

October 18, 1972
OMB No. 51-S72050
Approval expires December 31, 1972

1-(2)
ID# [ | | | | ] 2-5

6- (0)
7 (1)

8-10 blank

1.2 TRAINING PREFERENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the box that best describes the staff group to which you belong:

[ ] The President or other Chief Executive [ ]11-1

[ ] The Academic Dean, Academic Vice President, Dean of the Faculty [ ] -2

[ ] The Dean of Students, Dean of Student Personnel Services [ ] -3

[ ] The Vice President for Administration or other Chief Business Officer [ ] -4

[ ] The President of the Faculty Senate, of AAUP, of AFT, etc. [ ] -5

[ ] Staff Members in charge of Minority-Oriented Programs [ ] -6

The rows in the following tables represent specific types of training experiences and the colums represent categories of higher education personnel -- the people who would receive the training. There are six such tables, one for each of five categories of training and a summary table.

PLEASE PLACE A CHECK MARK IN EACH BOX THAT CORRESPONDS TO A TYPE OF TRAINING THAT YOU FEEL IS NECESSARY FOR INDIVIDUALS IN THE GIVEN CATEGORY OF STAFF AT YOUR INSTITUTION.

PLEASE CIRCLE THE THREE CHECK MARKS IN EACH TABLE THAT REPRESENT THE THREE MOST NECESSARY TYPES OF TRAINING.

You may check as many or as few boxes as you wish, but please circle only three of the check marks in each table. If you don't feel that you know about the training that a particular staff group could benefit from, please leave the column corresponding to that staff group blank.

Please check the types of training experiences that you feel would be necessary for the given groups of staff at your institution. You may check as many or as few boxes as you wish. Then, please circle the three check marks in the table that correspond to the three most necessary types of training experiences.

Category A: Training in Human Relations Skills

| | Yourself | President or Other Chief Administrative Officer | Chief Academic Officers and Deans | Chief Financial Officer(s) | Department Chairmen | Tenured Faculty | Non-tenured Faculty | Staff of Minority-Oriented Programs | Student Personnel & Academic Counselors | Financial Aid Officers | Other Educational Specialists: Librarian, CAI staff, etc. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Training in Group Dynamics Techniques | [ ] 12- | [ ] 13- | [ ] 14- | [ ] 15- | [ ] 16- | [ ] 17- | [ ] 18- | [ ] 19- | [ ] 20- | [ ] 21- | [ ] 22- | 23 blank |
| 2. Training in conducting training in Group Dynamic Techniques | [ ] 24- | [ ] 25- | [ ] 26- | [ ] 27- | [ ] 28- | [ ] 29- | [ ] 30- | [ ] 31- | [ ] 32- | [ ] 33- | [ ] 34- | 35 blank |
| 3. Training in interviewing, in working with students on a one-to-one basis | [ ] 36- | [ ] 37- | [ ] 38- | [ ] 39- | [ ] 40- | [ ] 41- | [ ] 42- | [ ] 43- | [ ] 44- | [ ] 45- | [ ] 46- | 47 blank |
| 4. Training in relating to people of other races and cultures | [ ] 48- | [ ] 49- | [ ] 50- | [ ] 51- | [ ] 52- | [ ] 53- | [ ] 54- | [ ] 55- | [ ] 56- | [ ] 57- | [ ] 58- | 59 blank |
| 5. Leadership Training | [ ] 60- | [ ] 61- | [ ] 62- | [ ] 63- | [ ] 64- | [ ] 65- | [ ] 66- | [ ] 67- | [ ] 68- | [ ] 69- | [ ] 70- | 71-80 blank<br>END CD 1<br>DUP 1-5<br>6-(0) 7-(2)<br>8-11 blank<br>23-80 blank<br>END CD 2 |
| 6. Training in conducting Leadership Training | [ ] 12- | [ ] 13- | [ ] 14- | [ ] 15- | [ ] 16- | [ ] 17- | [ ] 18- | [ ] 19- | [ ] 20- | [ ] 21- | [ ] 22- | |
| 7.*_____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |
| 8.*_____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |

*If we have failed to mention types of training experiences in Human Relations Skills that you feel are important, please write them in the blanks and check those additional boxes for whatever groups of staff you think that type of training would be very useful for.

Key:
0 if not checked
1 if checked but not circled
2 if checked and circled
9 if uninterpretable

Please check the types of training experiences that you feel would be necessary for the given groups of staff at your institution. You may check as many or as few boxes as you wish. Then, please circle the three check marks in the table that correspond to the three most necessary types of training experiences.

Category B: Training in Managerial Skills

| | Yourself | President or Other Chief Administrative Officer | Chief Academic Officers and Deans | Chief Financial Officer(s) | Department Chairmen | Tenured Faculty | Non-tenured Faculty | Staff of Minority-Oriented Programs | Student Personnel & Academic Counselors | Financial Aid Officers | Other Educational Specialists; Librarian, CAI staff, etc. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Training in developing goals & relating operating programs to them | [ ]12- | [ ]13- | [ ]14- | [ ]15- | [ ]16- | [ ]17- | [ ]18- | [ ]19- | [ ]20- | [ ]21- | [ ]22- | DUP 1-5<br>6-(0) 7-(3)<br>DUP 8-11<br>23 blank |
| 2. Training in allocating funds to competing needs | [ ]24- | [ ]25- | [ ]26- | [ ]27- | [ ]28- | [ ]29- | [ ]30- | [ ]31- | [ ]32- | [ ]33- | [ ]34- | 35 blank |
| 3. Training in planning physical facilities | [ ]36- | [ ]37- | [ ]38- | [ ]39- | [ ]40- | [ ]41- | [ ]42- | [ ]43- | [ ]44- | [ ]45- | [ ]46- | 47 blank |
| 4. Training in Accounting and Budgeting | [ ]48- | [ ]49- | [ ]50- | [ ]51- | [ ]52- | [ ]53- | [ ]54- | [ ]55- | [ ]56- | [ ]57- | [ ]58- | 59 blank |
| 5. Training in developing and managing a project | [ ]60- | [ ]61- | [ ]62- | [ ]63- | [ ]64- | [ ]65- | [ ]66- | [ ]67- | [ ]68- | [ ]69- | [ ]70- | 71-80 blank<br>END CD 3<br>DUP 1-5<br>6-(0) 7-(4)<br>DUP 8-11<br>23 blank |
| 6. Training in scheduling and budgeting a project | [ ]12- | [ ]13- | [ ]14- | [ ]15- | [ ]16- | [ ]17- | [ ]18- | [ ]19- | [ ]20- | [ ]21- | [ ]22- | |
| 7. Training in conducting meetings that get things done | [ ]24- | [ ]25- | [ ]26- | [ ]27- | [ ]28- | [ ]29- | [ ]30- | [ ]31- | [ ]32- | [ ]33- | [ ]34- | 35 blank |
| 8. Training in fund-raising from alumni and other private sources | [ ]36- | [ ]37- | [ ]38- | [ ]39- | [ ]40- | [ ]41- | [ ]42- | [ ]43- | [ ]44- | [ ]45- | [ ]46- | 47 blank |
| 9. Training in fund-raising from governmental agencies and other large institutions | [ ]48- | [ ]49- | [ ]50- | [ ]51- | [ ]52- | [ ]53- | [ ]54- | [ ]55- | [ ]56- | [ ]57- | [ ]58- | 59 blank<br>END CD 4 |
| 10.*_____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |
| 11.*_____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |

B13

*If we have failed to mention types of training experiences in Managerial Skills that you feel are important, please write them in the blanks and check those additional boxes for whatever groups of staff you think that type of training would be very useful for.

Key:

0 if not checked
1 if checked but not circled
2 if checked and circled
9 if uninterpretable

Please check the types of training experiences that you feel would be necessary for the given groups of staff at your institution. You may check as many or as few boxes as you wish. Then, please circle the three check marks in the table that correspond to the three most necessary types of training experiences.

Q-6

Category C: Training in Information Management Skills

| | Yourself | President or equal Chief Administrative Officer | Chief Academic Officers and Deans | Chief Financial Officer(s) | Department Chairmen | Tenured Faculty | Non-tenured Faculty | Staff of Minority-oriented Programs | Student personnel & Academic Counselors | Financial Aid Officers | Other Educational Specialists: Librarian, CAI staff, etc. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Training to improve reading skills | [ ] 12= | [ ] 13= | [ ] 14= | [ ] 15= | [ ] 16= | [ ] 17= | [ ] 18= | [ ] 19= | [ ] 20= | [ ] 21= | [ ] 22= | SKIP 1=5 6=(0). 7=(5) Rest blank |
| 2. Training in how to digest, summarize and report the contents of long documents | [ ] 24= | [ ] 25= | [ ] 26= | [ ] 27= | [ ] 28= | [ ] 29= | [ ] 30= | [ ] 31= | [ ] 32= | [ ] 33= | [ ] 34= | 23 blank<br>35 blank |
| 3. Training in how to use and utilize computers | [ ] 36= | [ ] 37= | [ ] 38= | [ ] 39= | [ ] 40= | [ ] 41= | [ ] 42= | [ ] 43= | [ ] 44= | [ ] 45= | [ ] 46= | 47 blank |
| 4. Training in effective use of information resources (libraries, data banks, etc.) | [ ] 48= | [ ] 49= | [ ] 50= | [ ] 51= | [ ] 52= | [ ] 53= | [ ] 54= | [ ] 55= | [ ] 56= | [ ] 57= | [ ] 58= | 59 blank |
| 5. Training to improve oral and written communication skills | [ ] 60= | [ ] 61= | [ ] 62= | [ ] 63= | [ ] 64= | [ ] 65= | [ ] 66= | [ ] 67= | [ ] 68= | [ ] 69= | [ ] 70= | 71-80 blank<br>END CD 5<br>SKIP 1=5<br>6=(0) 7=(6)<br>SKIP 8-11 |
| 6. Training in designing & implementing a research project | [ ] 12= | [ ] 13= | [ ] 14= | [ ] 15= | [ ] 16= | [ ] 17= | [ ] 18= | [ ] 19= | [ ] 20= | [ ] 21= | [ ] 22= | 23 blank |
| 7. Training in structuring and managing information flows | [ ] 24= | [ ] 25= | [ ] 26= | [ ] 27= | [ ] 28= | [ ] 29= | [ ] 30= | [ ] 31= | [ ] 32= | [ ] 33= | [ ] 34= | 35-80 blank<br>END CD 6 |
| 8.* _____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |
| 9.* _____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |

*If we have failed to mention types of training experiences in Information Management skills that you feel are important, please write them in the blanks and check those additional boxes for whatever groups of staff you think that type of training would be very useful for.

Key:
0 if not checked
1 if checked but not circled
2 if checked and circled
9 if uninterpretable

Category D: Training in how to handle current special problems in higher education

| | President | President or other Chief Administrative Officer | Chief Academic Officers and Deans | Chief Financial Officer(s) | Department Chairmen | Tenured Faculty | Non-tenured Faculty | Staff of Minority-Oriented Programs | Student Personnel & Academic Counselors | Financial Aid Officers | Other Educational Spec. (Athletic, staff, etc. Librarian, CAI | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Training in how to participate in collective bargaining | [ ]12= | [ ]13= | [ ]14= | [ ]15= | [ ]16= | [ ]17= | [ ]18= | [ ]19= | [ ]20= | [ ]21= | [ ]22= | 2CP 1-5<br>6=(0) 7=(7)<br>8-11 blank |
| 2. Training in coaching to & dealing with problems of drug abuse | [ ]24= | [ ]25= | [ ]26= | [ ]27= | [ ]28= | [ ]29= | [ ]30= | [ ]31= | [ ]32= | [ ]33= | [ ]34= | 23 blank<br>35 blank |
| 3. Training in the implications of new laws and judicial precedents as they relate to college & student problems | [ ]36= | [ ]37= | [ ]38= | [ ]39= | [ ]40= | [ ]41= | [ ]42= | [ ]43= | [ ]44= | [ ]45= | [ ]46= | 47 blank |
| 4. Training in the design, implementation & conduct of special programs for minority groups | [ ]48= | [ ]49= | [ ]50= | [ ]51= | [ ]52= | [ ]53= | [ ]54= | [ ]55= | [ ]56= | [ ]57= | [ ]58= | 59 blank |
| 5. Training in the design, implementation & conduct of special programs for the educationally disadvantaged | [ ]60= | [ ]61= | [ ]62= | [ ]63= | [ ]64= | [ ]65= | [ ]66= | [ ]67= | [ ]68= | [ ]69= | [ ]70= | 71-80 blank<br>END CD ?<br>2CP 1-5<br>6=(0) 7=(8)<br>8-11 blank |
| 6. Training in working with the changing roles of students in college governance | [ ]12= | [ ]13= | [ ]14= | [ ]15= | [ ]16= | [ ]17= | [ ]18= | [ ]19= | [ ]20= | [ ]21= | [ ]22= | 23 blank |
| 7. Training in how to help students formulate career objectives | [ ]24 | [ ]25= | [ ]26= | [ ]27= | [ ]28= | [ ]29= | [ ]30= | [ ]31= | [ ]32= | [ ]33= | [ ]34= | 35-80 blank<br>END CD 6 |
| 8.*_____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |
| 9.*_____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |

Key:
- 0 if not checked
- 1 if checked but not circled
- 2 if checked and circled
- 9 if uninterpretable

*If we have failed to mention types of training experiences in how to handle current special problems in higher education that you feel are important, please write them in the blanks and check those additional items for whatever groups of staff you think that type of training would be very useful for.

Please check the types of training experiences that you feel would be necessary for the given groups of staff at your institution. You may check as many or as few boxes as you wish. Then, please circle the three check marks in the table that correspond to the three most necessary types of training experiences.

Category E: Further Academic Studies

| | Yourself | President or Other Chief Administrative Officer | Chief Academic Officers and Deans | Chief Financial Officer(s) | Department Chairmen | Tenured Faculty | Non-tenured Faculty | Staff of Minority-Oriented Programs | Student Personnel & Academic Counselors | Financial Aid Officers | Other Educational Specialists: Librarian, CAI staff, etc. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Courses in the psychology, the sociology, the history or the philosophy of education | [ ] 12- | [ ] 13- | [ ] 14- | [ ] 15- | [ ]16- | [ ] 17- | [ ] 18- | [ ] 19- | [ ] 20- | [ ] 21- | [ ] 22- | 23 blank |
| 2. Education law courses | [ ] 24- | [ ] 25- | [ ] 26- | [ ] 27- | [ ]28- | [ ] 29- | [ ] 30- | [ ] 31- | [ ] 32- | [ ] 33- | [ ] 34- | 35 blank |
| 3. Courses deepening & updating individual academic studies | [ ] 36- | [ ] 37- | [ ] 38- | [ ] 39- | [ ]40- | [ ] 41- | [ ] 42- | [ ] 43- | [ ] 44- | [ ] 45- | [ ] 46- | 47 blank |
| 4. Courses in learning theory & its applications to teaching techniques | [ ] 48- | [ ] 49- | [ ] 50- | [ ] 51- | [ ]52- | [ ] 53- | [ ] 54- | [ ] 55- | [ ] 56- | [ ] 57- | [ ] 58- | 59 blank |
| 5. Courses in curriculum & course design & development | [ ] 60- | [ ] 61- | [ ] 62- | [ ] 63- | [ ]64- | [ ] 65- | [ ] 66- | [ ] 67- | [ ] 68- | [ ] 69- | [ ] 70- | 71-80 blank<br>END CD 9<br>DUP 1-5<br>6-(1) 7-(0)<br>DUP 8-11 |
| 6. Courses in test design & construction | [ ] 12- | [ ] 13- | [ ] 14- | [ ] 15- | [ ]16- | [ ] 17- | [ ] 18- | [ ] 19- | [ ] 20- | [ ] 21- | [ ] 22- | 23-80 blank<br>END CD 10 |
| 7.* _____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |
| 8.* _____ | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | [ ] | |

DUP 1-5
6-(0) 7-(9)
8-11 blank

*If we have failed to mention types of training experience in further academic studies that you feel are important, please write them in the blanks and check those additional boxes for whatever groups of staff you think that type of training would be very useful for.

Key:
0 if not checked
1 if checked but not circled
2 if checked and circled
9 if uninterpretable

Now, please check the Broad Training Categories (the rows) that you feel would be most important for individuals in the given groups of staff. Where appropriate, you may check more than one category of training for each staff group.

| Broad Training Categories | Yourself | President or Other Chief Administrative Officer | Chief Academic Officers and Deans | Chief Financial Officer(s) | Department Chairmen | Tenured Faculty | Non-tenured Faculty | Staff of Minority-Oriented Programs | Student Personnel & Academic Counselors | Financial Aid Officers | Other Educational specialists: Librarian, CAI staff, etc. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Training in Human Relations Skills | [ ] 12- | [ ] 13- | [ ] 14- | [ ] 15- | [ ] 16- | [ ] 17- | [ ] 18- | [ ] 19- | [ ] 20- | [ ] 21- | [ ]22- | 23 blank |
| B. Training in Managerial Skills | [ ] 24- | [ ] 25- | [ ] 26- | [ ] 27- | [ ] 28- | [ ] 29- | [ ] 30- | [ ] 31- | [ ] 32- | [ ] 33- | [ ]34- | 35 blank |
| C. Training in Information Management Skills | [ ] 36- | [ ] 37- | [ ] 38- | [ ] 39- | [ ] 40- | [ ] 41- | [ ] 42- | [ ] 43- | [ ] 44- | [ ] 45- | [ ]46- | 47 blank |
| D. Training in how to handle current special problems in Higher Education | [ ] 48- | [ ] 49- | [ ] 50- | [ ] 51- | [ ] 52- | [ ] 53- | [ ] 54- | [ ] 55- | [ ] 56- | [ ] 57- | [ ]58- | 59 blank |
| E. Further Academic Studies | [ ] 60- | [ ] 61- | [ ] 62- | [ ] 63- | [ ] 64- | [ ] 65- | [ ] 66- | [ ] 67- | [ ] 68- | [ ] 69- | [ ]70- | 71-80 blank |

DUP 1-5
6-(1) 7-(1)
8-11 blank

END CD 11

Key:

0 if not checked
1 if checked but not circled
2 if checked and circled
9 if uninterpretable

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION.

B-7

Please return this Questionnaire in the attached envelope addressed to our research contractor, Abt Associates Inc., 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

Thank you again for your time and cooperation.

PLEASE USE THIS SPACE FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: